

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-16, and 18-20 are pending in the application. Independent claims 1, 7, and 13, and dependent claims 2, 5, and 6 have been amended by the present amendment. The amendments are fully supported by the application as originally filed (see, e.g., specification at page 20, second paragraph; page 21, second and third paragraphs; and page 23, third paragraph to page 24, first paragraph).

As amended, independent claims 1 and 7 recite an image sending method and an image sending device, respectively, including "selecting and setting an index of an image quality" for image data to be sent, and setting a resolution corresponding to the index of the image quality, where "the resolution corresponding to the index of the image quality differs from one sending mode to another." Similarly, independent claim 13 has been amended to recite that processing contents are set based on the index of the image quality, and the processing contents corresponding to the index of the image quality differ from one sending mode to another.

According to the Applicants' claimed invention, a resolution/processing contents are set according to both an index of image quality (for example, "standard," "fine," "super fine," and "ultra fine" as described on page 11, third paragraph of the specification) and a sending mode (see, e.g., specification at page 23, last line to page 24, line 4), and the resolution corresponding to the index of the image quality differs from one sending mode to another (see, e.g., specification at page 20, second paragraph; and page 21, second and third paragraphs).

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-16, and 18-20 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,488,483 to Murayama in view of U.S. Patent 6,614,551 to Peek. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding the rejection of independent claims 1, 7, and 13 over the proposed combination of Murayama in view of Peek, the proposed combination does not teach or suggest an image sending method or image sending device including "selecting and setting an index of

an image quality" for image data to be sent, and setting a resolution corresponding to the index of the image quality, where "the resolution corresponding to the index of the image quality differs from one sending mode to another," as recited in independent claim 1 (*see also* independent claims 7 and 13).

Murayama teaches the ability to select either the G4 facsimile protocol or color, and also select either standard resolution (200dpi x 200dpi) or precision resolution (400dpi x 400dpi). However, there is no teaching or suggestion that the resolution "differs from one sending mode to another." In Murayama, for example, the same standard resolution (200dpi x 200dpi) can be used in both G4 and color modes (see column 5, line 44 to column 6, line 31 of Murayama).

In Peek, a fax machine is operable as either a standard fax machine (see, e.g., column 6, lines 15-16) or as a personal computer for transmitting email (see, e.g., column 7, lines 24-27).

However, there is no teaching or suggestion in the Murayama and Peek references, whether taken alone or in combination, of "selecting and setting an index of an image quality" for image data to be sent, and setting a resolution corresponding to the index of the image quality, where "the resolution corresponding to the index of the image quality differs from one sending mode to another," as recited in independent claim 1 (*see also* claims 7 and 13).

It is believed that the claims are in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven M. Jensen/

---

Steven M. Jensen  
(Reg. No. 42,693)  
Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge  
P.O. Box 55874  
Boston, MA 02205

Date: April 24, 2008

Phone: (617) 239-0100

Customer No. 21874